



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

survey of the development of local government in this country, and concludes the book with three chapters on the prospects of Anglo-Saxon freedom. In these last his enthusiasm for the race has a tendency to run away with his judgment, and his visions for the future might well strike a stranger to the blood as a trifle fanciful. It must be added, on the other hand, that although the book is written, to a great extent, as a panegyric on democracy, the treatment of history is surprisingly impartial.

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL.

Boston.

THE CONFLICTS OF CAPITAL AND LABOR, HISTORICALLY AND ECONOMICALLY CONSIDERED. Being a History and Review of the Trade Unions of Great Britain, showing their Origin, Progress, Constitution, and Objects, in their varied Political, Social, Economical, and Industrial Aspects. By GEORGE HOWELL, M.P. 2d ed., 8vo., pp. xxxvi., 536. London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1890.

To those acquainted with the earlier edition of this work it is unnecessary to speak of its general characteristics, or to say that the author argues for trade unions by describing them, and that his description is clear, candid, and thorough. The first edition appeared in 1878, and to its influence is partly due the great change observable since that date in the attitude of the general public toward trade unions, both in England and the United States.

Indeed Mr. Howell's experience exemplifies the truth so often stated that the radical of one period becomes the conservative of the next. In his preface to the second edition he notes the fact, which may be easily verified by reference to the files of English periodical literature, that "in 1878 trade unions were denounced in the press, on the platform, in the pulpit, and in Parliament; not occasionally, but constantly, persistently, and virulently." On the other hand, he states, with equal truth, that "now trade unions are being praised and commended by all sorts and conditions of men, their influence is sought socially

and politically, and combination is preached as the one great panacea for all kinds of social evils, even by the Lords' Committee on 'Sweating'." His severe condemnation of force and coercion, which, when the first edition appeared, was considered weak and insufficient, he thinks may now be regarded as uncalled for, and possibly impertinent, by those who show an inclination to excuse intimidation and palliate violence.

This radical change of public opinion regarding the subject treated by Mr. Howell, has made it hard to adapt the old book to the new situation. Though it has been largely re-written, it retains traces of the struggle waging at the time it first appeared, and the mingling of paragraphs written in 1877-78 with others written in 1890 sometimes makes it doubtful just what the present tense stands for. After reading a long descriptive passage which might be supposed to set forth present conditions, it is disappointing to find in the body of the text a paragraph beginning, "Since the preceding pages were written," followed by a description of changes, and finally of entirely different conditions than those first described. This confusion is especially noticeable in the chapter on "Political Economy and Trade Unions." Had it been first written in 1890 much that it now contains would not have been inserted, were the author's view never so insular; while, on the other hand, it contains references to many events that have happened, and to many books and articles that have appeared since the earlier edition was written. Perhaps the author would have done better to prepare a companion volume to his earlier work, rather than to bring out a revised edition of it.

Turning to the matters that pertain to the more recent developments we notice, first, that Mr. Howell does effective work against the so-called "new trade unionists." They object to the insurance features of the unions, and teach that such organizations should be mainly for belligerent purposes. He shows that the type of union they praise

is an old one, which has existed from the beginning, and, while constantly being tried, has constantly proved itself unreliable. The unions that have an extensive system of sick benefits, out-of-work benefits, death benefits, and pensions for superannuated members succeed better in keeping up wages and securing good conditions of labor than those that have no mission save that of agitation and opposition to employers.

The assertions made by certain radicals that the advancement of English laborers through trade unions has nearly reached its limit, are not wholly discredited by the facts set forth in this volume. One might almost think that the late-won approval of the well-to-do classes has had a deadening effect upon the unions. It is not merely that the number of members represented at the annual trades union congresses increases slowly, and is not now (in 1889 the number was 885,055) as great as at times during the early seventies (in 1874 it was 1,191,922); but the unions seem in some sort to have "finished the fight," and to be willing to settle down to the enjoyment of their hard-won prosperity. Of the ten specific reforms debated and urged by the Trades Union Congress of 1878, all but one or two have been accomplished; and Mr. Howell observes that at the Congress held at Dundee, 1889, the Parliamentary Committee did not formulate any elaborate programme, and that while the eight-hour day and factory inspection were matters of debate and discussion, and while some of the decisions of former years were reaffirmed, yet the discussions were more general and personal than they had been at many previous Congresses.

Mr. Howell suggests various ways in which the unions might profitably extend their activities, but he does not himself seem to be very sanguine that they will adopt a vigorous and constructive policy. He does not expect the solution of all industrial problems to be worked out by trade unions, but he finds that they have been an efficient means of bettering the condition of great numbers of

laborers, and of bringing about a more enduring organization of industrial society.

University of Nebraska.

AMOS G. WARNER.

THE UNION-STATE: A LETTER TO OUR STATES-RIGHTS FRIEND.
By JOHN C. HURD, LL.D. Paper, pp. 131. New York: Van
Nostrand Company, 1890.

THERE seems to be no cessation of discussion involving the origin of National sovereignty, the growth of the Constitution and the powers of the several States, nor are great diversities of opinion wanting among present writers. And it must be conceded that recent discussions and investigations of scholars have brought about a clearer understanding of questions that hitherto have been disposed of by political dogma. The pamphlet now before me, as the title suggests, is a vigorous denial of the doctrine of States' Rights as a justification of secession. The burden of the argument consists (1) in showing that not one of the thirteen Colonies ever possessed an independent sovereignty, and consequently not one of the States could lay claim to it, and (2) in repudiating most of the theories offered as "defences" to the action of the Government in the restoration of the Union. To these ends the writer holds that each several State jurisdiction is actually dependent upon the "will and force of the thirteen Colonies together constituting a single possessor of sovereignty"; that the status of each disclaims that sovereignty could have been obtained otherwise than by united action. From these propositions as facts he derives the following conclusions: (1) that "A single possessor of the entire sum of sovereign powers had come into being in the person of thirteen States manifesting the will and force to hold such power as one national State within all of the territory known as the United States; (2) that, whether sovereign powers can or cannot, in theory, be divided, they were not so divided in the case of these States, July 4, 1776, and that, regarded as sovereign powers, those exercised in the